


07-14-05

PATENT APPLICATION

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10012518-1

IN THE  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Inventor(s): Julie T. Dawe

Application No.: 10/066,132

Filing Date: 01/30/2002

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR THE TRANSFERENCE OF INFORMATION REGARDING  
STATUS OF AN APPLICATION PROGRAM

Confirmation No.: 5684

Examiner: M. Roswell

Group Art Unit: 2173

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is the Appeal Brief in this application with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on 05/17/2005.

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is (37 CFR 1.17(c)) \$500.00.

(complete (a) or (b) as applicable)

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) apply.

( ) (a) Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 (fees: 37 CFR 1.17(a)-(d) for the total number of months checked below:

( ) one month	\$120.00
( ) two months	\$450.00
( ) three months	\$1020.00
( ) four months	\$1590.00

( ) The extension fee has already been filled in this application.

( ) (b) Applicant believes that no extension of time is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

Please charge to Deposit Account 08-2025 the sum of \$500.00. At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 CFR 1.25. Additionally please charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

(X) I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV482707638US, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Deposit: July 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Julie T. Dawe

By

R. Ross Viguet

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 42,203

Date: 07/13/2005

Typed Name: Lisa deCordova

Signature:

*Lisa deCordova*

Telephone No.: (214) 855-8185

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400



Docket No.: 10012518-1  
(PATENT)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:  
Julie T. Dawe

Application No.: 10/066,132

Confirmation No.: 5684

Filed: January 30, 2002

Art Unit: 2173

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR THE  
TRANSFERENCE OF INFORMATION  
REGARDING STATUS OF AN APPLICATION  
PROGRAM

Examiner: M. Roswell

**APPEAL BRIEF**

MS Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

As required under § 41.37(a), this brief is filed within two months of the Notice of Appeal filed in this case on May 17, 2005, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal.

The fees required under § 41.20(b)(2) are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1206:

- |       |   |
|-------|---|
| I.    | Real Party In Interest                        |
| II    | Related Appeals and Interferences             |
| III.  | Status of Claims                              |
| IV.   | Status of Amendments                          |
| V.    | Summary of Claimed Subject Matter             |
| VI.   | Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal |
| VII.  | Argument                                      |
| VIII. | Claims  |
| IX.   | Evidence                                      |

25552893.1

07/15/2005 HBERHE 00000009 082025 10066132

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

X.                    Related Proceedings  
Appendix A        Claims

I.        REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P., a Texas Limited Partnership having its principal place of business in Houston, Texas.

II.       RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III.      STATUS OF CLAIMS

A.       Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 18 claims pending in application.

B.       Current Status of Claims

1.       Claims canceled: None
2.       Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None
3.       Claims pending: 1-18
4.       Claims allowed: None
5.       Claims rejected: 1-18

C.       Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-18

#### IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Applicant filed a Response After Final Rejection on April 7, 2005 in which no claims were amended. The Examiner responded to the Amendment After Final Rejection in an Advisory Action mailed April 20, 2005. Accordingly, the claims enclosed herein as Appendix A are as were pending at final rejection and do not incorporate any amendments after final rejection.

#### V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

According to one embodiment, a method of generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program comprises receiving a first data stream having a first format (paragraph 21, lines 6-8, Figure 1, item 105), encapsulating the first data stream in the first format into a predetermined second format (paragraph 21, lines 8-10, Figure 1, item 107), aggregating information contained in the first data stream output in the second format by applying a first set of rules organizing the information into a plurality of categories (paragraph 21, lines 11-15, Figure 1, item 108), and displaying a graphical representation of parameters relating to each of the categories in response to changes in the information contained in the first data stream (paragraph 23, Figure 1, item 110, Figures 4-6).

According to another embodiment, a system for generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program comprises an encapsulator (Figure 1, item 107) configured to encapsulate a first data stream (Figure 1, item 105) output in a first format from the application program into a predetermined second format (paragraph 21, lines 6-10), an aggregator (Figure 1, item 108) configured to aggregate information contained in the first data stream output in the second format by applying a first set of rules organizing the information into a plurality of categories (paragraph 21, lines 11-15), and a display (Figure 1, item 110) configured to display a graphical representation (Figures 4-6) of parameters relating to each of the categories in response to changes in the information contained in the first data stream output.

According to still another embodiment, a computer readable media containing a software program for generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program comprises software configured to encapsulate a first data stream in a first

format from the application program into a predetermined second format (paragraph 21, lines 8-10, Figure 1, item 107), aggregate information contained in the first data stream output in the second format by applying a first set of rules organizing the information into a plurality of categories (paragraph 21, lines 11-15, Figure 1, item 108), and display a graphical representation of parameters relating to each of the categories in response to changes in the information contained in the first data stream output (paragraph 23, Figure 1, item 110, Figures 4-6).

## VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Martinez et al.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Martinez et al. in view of Jancke et al.

## VII. ARGUMENT

### A. The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Martinez et al., United States patent number 5,956,665 (hereinafter *Martinez*). To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must teach every element of the claim, see M.P.E.P. § 2131. Moreover, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim,” see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Additionally, in order for a prior art reference to be anticipatory under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to a claim, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim,” see M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Appellant respectfully asserts that *Martinez* does not teach every element of the claims, and particularly not in complete detail as is contained in the claims, and does not show elements arranged as required by the claims.

## 1. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 13

Independent claim 1 recites “[a] method of generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program . . . .” Similarly, independent claim 7 recites “[a] system for generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program . . . .” Likewise, independent claim 13 recites “generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program . . . .”

In responding to Appellant’s arguments with respect to *Martinez* not teaching generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program, the Appellee asserts that “the application program of *Martinez* provides the user with control of the components within in the system, and displays user changes and settings through the GUI,” the final Office Action at page 5. The Appellee further asserts that “as the interface of *Martinez* displays the status of the components of the system, it also displays the status of the application program,” *id.* The Appellee states that “the examiner contends that as the application allows the user to set and monitor various component attributes, the application of *Martinez* displays visually perceptible output relating to the status of the application itself,” the Advisory Action at page 2.

Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Appellee’s assertions are accurate, the foregoing does not establish that the disclosure of *Martinez* anticipates claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For example, assuming the application program of *Martinez* displays the status of this application program, as asserted by the Appellee, *Martinez* does not show generating such a displayed application program status by encapsulating the first data stream into a predetermined second format and aggregating information contained in the first data stream, as set forth in the claims. The data received and operated upon by the application program of *Martinez* is associated with various field replaceable unit components (e.g., disk drives, environmental monitoring units, etcetera), not the application program identified by the Appellee. Accordingly, the disclosure of *Martinez* does not meet the claims.

Moreover, there is nothing in the disclosure which teaches that the application program identified by the Appellee does in fact display the status of the application program, nor has the Appellee shown otherwise. Accordingly, a *prima facie* showing of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 has not been made of record.

Even if the rejection of record seeks to assert that it is inherent that such an application program displays the status thereof, the rejection of record has not properly established a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. In order to properly establish a rejection based on inherency, “the Appellee must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art,” M.P.E.P. § 2112, citing *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis original). The Appellee’s statement that “as the interface of *Martinez* displays the status of the components of the system” does not reasonably support a conclusion that “it also displays the status of the application program”. Accordingly, inherency of the claim limitation has not properly been established.

The Appellee’s assertion that the application of *Martinez* displays visually perceptible output relating to the status of the application itself because, as the Appellee contends in the Advisory Action, the application allows the user to set and monitor various component attributes, is not supported by the disclosure of *Martinez*. For example, *Martinez* describes monitoring user input to the application to determine the affected device as well as the affected access device, see column 12, lines 9-14. The monitoring operations of the application GUI detect the change in the status of the affected device and provide user feedback indicating that the desired change has occurred, see column 12, lines 37-41. Accordingly, the user may select a particular monitored device and make changes which affect that device. However, there is nothing to teach that the application program provides output relating to the status of the application itself. The identical invention is not shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claims as required by *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 further recites “aggregating information contained in said first data stream output in said second format by applying a first set of rules organizing said information into a plurality of categories . . . .” Similarly, claim 7 recites “an aggregator configured to aggregate information contained in said first data stream output in said second format by applying a first set of rules organizing said information into a plurality of categories . . . .” Claim 13 recites “software configured to . . . aggregate information contained in said first data stream output in said second format by applying a first set of rules organizing said

information into a plurality of categories . . . .” In responding to Appellant pointing out that *Martinez* does not teach the foregoing, the Appellee asserts that “[i]nherently, the data received from these components must be encapsulated into a second format, as the data changes from a non-visual state (first format) to being visually represented by the GUI (second format),” see the final Office Action at page 5.

Assuming *arguendo* that visually displaying the data by the GUI comprises a second format into which data from the components is aggregated, there is nothing in the disclosure of *Martinez* to teach or suggest aggregating information from the components which is output in the second format (visually represented by the GUI) by applying a first set of rules organizing the information into a plurality of categories. The Appellee relies upon it being “inherent that in order for the mapping operation and updating operation of *Martinez* to form an update the data structures used in the system, the operations must follow a set of rules for organizing the received information into the proper locations in the data structures,” the final Office Action at pages 5-6, to meet the foregoing application of rules. However, the Appellee’s assertion does not address the express limitation that aggregation of information by applying a first set of rules is with respect to information contained in the first data stream output in the second format (the data being visually represented by the GUI in the rejection of record). Accordingly, the system of *Martinez* as set forth in the rejection of record does not show elements arranged as required by the claims.

In light of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 7, and 13 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over *Martinez*. Moreover, as the dependent claims incorporate the limitations of the base claim from which they depend, claims 4, 5, 8, 11, and 16 are asserted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 7, and 13.

## 2. Claims 5 and 11

Claim 5 recites “creating an artistic graphical representation for presentation of information to a user.” Claim 11 recites “an artistic graphical representation for presentation of information to a user.” In rejecting these claims, the Appellee relies upon Figure 6 and column 10, 32-42, of *Martinez*, see the final Office Action at page 3. The Appellee has, however, not identified any part of the display represented in Figure 6 asserted to comprise a



graphical representation for presentation of the information to the user, and Appellant cannot identify any. In particular, the display of Figure 6 appears to provide a utilitarian presentation of the information, having a graphical representation of a physical shelf (see Figure 2) and associated fields of data, see column 9, lines 21-31. The disclosure at column 10, lines 32-42, relied upon by the Appellee merely teaches that the GUI presents a graphical representation of each shelf as well as other status information, and that the form of the display and the layout of the information can take a variety of forms. There is nothing in this disclosure to teach or suggest an artistic graphical representation as set forth in the claim, see e.g., the present specification at paragraphs 28-30. Accordingly, claims 5 and 11, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patentable over the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record.

### 3. Claim 8

Claim 8 recites that “said display is further configured to generate an analog representation of said information.” The Appellee relies upon item 92 of Figure 6 in rejecting the claim, see the final Office Action at page 3. Specifically, the Appellee asserts that item 92 is a meter reflecting the status of system components. However, a review of the specification of *Martinez* does not reveal any description of item 92 being a meter. Moreover, although there is a bar having numbers and lines thereon shown below item 92, there is no needle or other indicator shown to establish that the bar comprises a meter reflecting the status of system components. Instead, it appears that the data is provided digitally in item 92. Clearly the identical invention is not shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### 4. Claim 16

Claim 16 recites “encapsulating a second data stream output in a third format from said application program into said predetermined second format . . . .” Accordingly, read with the limitations of claim 13 from which claim 16 depends, data in a first and third format is encapsulated into the second format. In rejecting this claim, the Appellee generally avers that “Martinez teaches a method, system, and software program capable of receiving a second data stream (taught as the retrieval of information related to multiple components of a system by a monitoring unit, at col. 10, lines 4-19), [and] encapsulating the second data stream into a second format,” the final Office Action at page 3. However, the rejection of record fails to

address the express claim language requiring the second data stream to be in a third format. Moreover, *Martinez* teaching retrieval of information related to multiple components of a system, as asserted by Appellee, is insufficient to meet the language of the claim. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of record is improper.

B. The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Martinez* in view of Jancke et al., United States patent 5,764,913 (hereinafter *Jancke*). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met, see M.P.E.P. § 2143. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Without conceding the second criteria, Applicant respectfully asserts that the references lack proper motivation to combine in addition to the rejections of record relying upon a combination of *Martinez* and *Jancke* not meeting all the claim limitations.

Appellant has shown above that *Martinez* does not teach every element of independent claims 1, 7, and 13. Dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18 are each directly or indirectly dependent from one of the above independent claims, and thus inherit the limitations recited therein. The 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections of record do not rely upon the disclosure of *Jancke* to meet the above identified deficiencies in the disclosure of *Martinez*. As such, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 18. Moreover, the dependent claims recite additional limitations which are neither present in, nor obvious from, the applied references.

1. Claims 2, 9, 14, and 17

Claim 2 recites “encoding an aural representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said data stream in said second format.” Claims 9, 14, and 17 recite similar limitations. In rejecting these claims, the Appellee concedes that *Martinez* does not meet the claim but asserts that *Jancke*

teaches using an audio tone or wave file to notify a user of the operational state of a node in the network, the final Office Action at page 4. However, assuming *arguendo* that the foregoing assertion were accurate, the rejection of record fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with respect to claims 2, 9, 14, and 17. For example, the rejection of record fails to address the claim language requiring that the aural representation be of parameters relating to each of the categories.

Moreover, the motivation given for one of ordinary skill having found it obvious to modify *Martinez* in view of *Jancke* is that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of *Martinez* and *Jancke* before him at the time the invention was made to modify the monitoring and notifying system of *Martinez* to include the aural notification of *Jancke* in order to obtain a system of monitoring streaming data wherein a user is notified of changes and status aurally,” the final Office Action at page 4. The Appellee further states that “[o]ne would be motivated to make such a combination for the obvious advantage of keeping a user aware of the status of data without having to view the data changes on a monitor,” *id.* The language of the recited motivation is circular in nature, stating that it is obvious to make the modification (add aural notification) because it is obvious to achieve the result (have aural notification). Such language is merely a statement that the reference can be modified, and does not state any desirability for making the modification. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination, *In re Mills*, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Thus, the motivation provided by the Examiner is improper, as the motivation must establish the desirability for making the modification.

2. Claims 3, 6, 10, 12, 15, and 18

Claim 3 recites “defining a color palette, wherein colors of the color palette are associated with human recognized process status conditions and represent the status conditions.” Claims 6, 10, 12, 15, and 18 recite similar limitations. In rejecting these claims, the Appellee states that “*Jancke* teaches defining a color palette where the colors are associated with human recognized process status conditions, taught as the use of a stop light metaphor incorporating the colors green, yellow, and red for various states of a node,” the

final Office Action at page 5. However, “[t]o support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references,” *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). The Appellee appears to concede that *Martinez* does not suggest the claim by silence in this regard (in contravention of the factual considerations which are to be set forth under the decision in *Graham v. John Deere and Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966)) and by reliance upon *Jancke*. The rejection of record does not set forth any reasoning as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify *Martinez* in view of *Jancke* to include colors of a color palette associated with human recognized process status conditions. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established with respect to claims 3, 6, 10, 12, 15, and 18.

#### VIII. CLAIMS

A copy of the claims involved in the present appeal is attached hereto as Appendix A. As indicated above, the claims in Appendix A do not incorporate any amendments after final rejection.

#### IX. EVIDENCE

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS


No related proceedings are referenced in II. above, or copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided, hence no Appendix is included.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as Express Mail Airbill No. EV482707638US, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,  
on the date shown below.


Date of Deposit: July 13, 2005

Typed Name: Lisa deCordova

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



Respectfully submitted,

By   
R. Ross Viguet  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No.: 42,203

Date: July 13, 2005

Telephone No. (214) 855-8185

**APPENDIX A**

**Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 10/066,132**

1. (Original) A method of generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program comprising steps of:

receiving a first data stream having a first format;  
encapsulating said first data stream in said first format into a predetermined second format;

aggregating information contained in said first data stream output in said second format by applying a first set of rules organizing said information into a plurality of categories; and

displaying a graphical representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said first data stream.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1 further including the step of:  
encoding an aural representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said data stream in said second format.

3. (Original) The method of claim 1 further including the step of:  
defining a color palette, wherein colors of the color palette are associated with human recognized process status conditions and represent the status conditions.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein said steps of receiving, encapsulating, aggregating and displaying are performed in real time with respect to said application program.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, further including the step of:  
creating an artistic graphical representation for presentation of information to a user.

6. (Original) The method of claim 5, further including the step of:  
defining a color palette, wherein colors of the color palette are associated with human recognized process status condition and represent the status condition.

7. (Previously Presented) A system for generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program comprising:

an encapsulator configured to encapsulate a first data stream output in a first format from said application program into a predetermined second format;

an aggregator configured to aggregate information contained in said first data stream output in said second format by applying a first set of rules organizing said information into a plurality of categories; and

a display configured to display a graphical representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said first data stream output.

8. (Original) The system of claim 7 wherein said display is further configured to generate an analog representation of said information.

9. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 7 further including:

an encoder for encoding an aural representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said data stream output.

10. (Original) The system of claim 7 further including:

a color palette, wherein the color palette includes colors which are associated with human recognized process status conditions and are used to represent the status conditions.

11. (Original) The system of claim 7 further including:

an artistic graphical representation for presentation of information to a user.

12. (Original) The system of claim 11 further including:

a color palette, the colors of which are associated with human recognized process status condition and used to represent the status condition.

13. (Previously Presented) A computer readable media containing a software program for generating a visually perceptible output indicative of a status of an application program comprising software configured to:

encapsulate a first data stream in a first format from said application program into a predetermined second format;

aggregate information contained in said first data stream output in said second format by applying a first set of rules organizing said information into a plurality of categories; and

display a graphical representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said first data stream output.

14. (Original) The computer readable media of claim 13 wherein the software is further configured to:

encode an aural representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said data stream output.

15. (Original) The computer readable media of claim 13 wherein the software is further configured to:

define a color palette the colors of which are associated with human recognized process status conditions and representing the status conditions.

16. (Original) The computer readable media of claim 13 wherein the software is further configured to:

encapsulate a second data stream output in a third format from said application program into said predetermined second format;

aggregate information contained in said second data stream output in said third format by applying a second set of rules organizing said information into a plurality of categories; and

display a graphical representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said second data stream output.

17. (Original) The computer readable media of claim 16 wherein the software is further configured to:

encode a aural representation of parameters relating to each of said categories in response to changes in said information contained in said data stream output.



18. (Original) The computer readable media of claim 16 wherein the software is further configured to:

define a color palette the colors of which are associated with human recognized process status conditions and representing the status conditions.